



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,980	07/11/2003	Lieven Leopold Albertine Trappeniers	Q76440	2865
72875	7590	66/02/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2155			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/02/2008	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@sughrue.com
kghyndman@sughrue.com
USPatDocketing@sughrue.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/616,980
Filing Date: July 11, 2003
Appellant(s): TRAPPENIERS ET AL.

ALCATEL
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 4, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed July 2, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Predictive bandwidth allocation method and apparatus U.S. Patent No. 6,208,640 B1 issued to Spell et al., (hereinafter referred to as Spell) Published March 27, 2001.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Spell et al.**, (Hereinafter referred to as Spell) U.S. Patent No. **6,208,640**.

As to claim 1, Spell method for allocating network resources by just-in-time modulation of quality of service (QoS) comprising:

receiving a user profile from a client terminal, said user profile comprising aggregated user behavior information recorded at said client terminal (col. 4, lines 7-13, knowledge for a given user through user parameters that a particular type of data stream occurring during a certain time period is likely to be relatively long or relatively short);

receiving QoS demands from said client terminal, said QoS demands determined based on said user profile (col. 11, lines 10-30, bandwidth usage and other statistics are collected); and

allocating network resources to said client terminal based on said QoS demands (col. 11, lines 10-30, coordinating switching up of channels and adding bandwidth based on user requirements).

As to claim 2, Spell teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the method is performed according to QoS user preferences (col. 7, lines 7-31).

As to claim 3, Spell teaches the method according to claim 2, wherein said QoS user preferences specify a QoS demanding strategy (col. 7, lines 7-31).

As to claim 4, Spell teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein said QoS demands are predicted by a neural network (col. 4, lines 13-24).

As to claim 5, Spell teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the coordinating concurrent QoS demands of a manifold of users (col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 14).

As to claim 11, Spell teaches the method according to claim 4, wherein said prediction is based on said aggregated service usage and user behavior information recorded at said client terminal (col. 4, lines 7-27).

As to claim 12, Spell teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein coordinating concurrent QoS demands of a manifold of users comprises evaluating QoS demands of a manifold of users, and balancing QoS grants based on QoS user profiles of said manifold of users (col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 14)..

Claims 6-10 do not teach or define any new limitation above claims 1-5 and 11-12; therefore, they are rejected for similar reasons.

(10) Response to Argument

As per appellant's arguments filed on February 4, 2008, the appellant argues in substance that Spell fails to teach receiving a user profile from a client terminal, said

user profile comprising aggregated user behavior information recorded at said client terminal (refer to Appeal Brief pages 11-12).

Spell et al., teaches wherein allocation of telecommunication systems bandwidth is provided preferably in a predictive fashion. Packets are identified with particular data streams and characteristics of the data streams are used to predict probable future bandwidth requirements. Such predictions are used to allocate high-bandwidth channels, such as ISDN B channels and to close or switch channels as in accordance with predicted needs. Preferably the system is self-learning and can modify a rules base for making allocation decisions e.g. based on actual use statistics. in addition to (or in place of) using classifications of data streams as to type of data, other information useful in predicting future bandwidth requirements for a data stream are employed (such as knowledge for a given user (*equated to the claimed aggregated user behavior information*) that a particular type of data stream occurring during a certain time period is likely to be relatively long or relatively short). The overall system of Spell teaches wherein the system makes allocation decisions based on statistics and user parameters collected on a user and further based on inputs received from a user. for example, when the user specifies to the system that e-mail messages are to receive top priority regardless of cost (col. 4, lines 7-13 and col. 11, lines 10-30). Therefore, the system of Spell et al., taking into consideration actual usages of the user as well as user input to make the overall bandwidth allocation decision meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawki S Ismail/
Examiner, Art Unit 2155

Conferees:

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155

/Ario Etienne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157